



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ein ziemlich getreues Abbild der gesellschaftlichen Zustände in Deutschland um die Wende des 19. Jahrhunderts.—Selbst wenn man ohne weiteres zugäbe, dass Sudermann getreu nach dem Leben gezeichnet habe, so bleibt zu erinnern, dass er sich mit einer Gesellschaftsklasse befasst, die nur in Berlin und einigen anderen grösseren Städten gedeiht, dass diese Klasse einen verschwindend kleinen Bruchteil der Bevölkerung jener Grossstädte ausmacht, und dass endlich Berlin, selbst in seiner Totalität, ebensowenig Deutschland ist, wie New York die nordamerikanische Union. So dürfte jene Weissagung wohl doch zuschanden werden, und das Land wird sich hoffentlich noch auf recht lange hinaus des verderblichen Einflusses erwehren, der ohne Zweifel von dorthier ausgeht.

JOSEF WIEHR.

University of Illinois.

AN INTRODUCTION TO OLD FRENCH PHONOLOGY
AND MORPHOLOGY by Frederick Bliss Luquiens, As-
sistant Professor of Spanish in the Sheffield Scientific
School of Yale University, Yale University Press, 1909.

Through the appearance of Professor Grandgent's admirable *Outline of the Phonology and Morphology of Old Provençal* and his equally scholarly *Introduction to Vulgar Latin* we have been led to hope that an Old French Grammar of similar scope might follow. To be sure, the publication of such a book is not a crying need. Provençal and Popular Latin had not received separate treatment in easily accessible form before the appearance of Grandgent's treatises, but Grammars are not lacking for the study of Old French. Students of this subject are naturally familiar with Modern French, and if their reading knowledge of Modern German should be weak the absolute need of perfecting this knowledge for the successful pursuit of advanced studies is so evident that even a German Grammar is not looked upon as an insuperable obstacle. Teachers of this subject have thus been able to choose between Nyrop's clear and readable *Grammaire Historique de la Langue Française* and Schwan's *Grammatik des Altfranzösischen neu bearbeitet von Behrens*. It is not the intention here to institute a comparison between these two works. Either has merits which the other lacks. The writer has used them both and found the French work on the whole a little more acceptable, not because it is the better of the two, but because it is clear and readable. The German Grammar is more concise and ap-

parently bewilders the student with an amount of detail whose bearing he is unable to understand, largely because his knowledge of German is insufficient for the purpose. Nor is this difficulty removed by the French translation which the Schwau-Behrens Grammar has received. Whether the arrangement of the subject and the tremendous mass of detail be the cause, or the fact that the concise German method of statement made a clear French rendering impossible, experience seems to show that even in this French form the German Grammar continues to overwhelm the beginner in French Philology. The announcement of the book before us brought to mind all the difficulties that we have met in the presentation of this subject. The first thought was that at last we should have the opportunity of teaching with an English book prepared especially for American students.

The title of the book is rather misleading. It is not so much an introduction to Old French as an Introduction to the Schwan-Behrens Grammar. To be sure, there has been no intention on the part of Professor Luquiens to conceal this fact. He gives ample credit to the German Grammar in his Preface, but the full measure of the relation of the two books could hardly be inferred from what he says there. It is so close and vital that it would not have been improper to introduce the names of Schwan and Behrens into the title page.

One may question the advisability of publishing an Old French Grammar composed in this manner. Granting that an elementary book on this subject would be welcomed by American students, it would be possible to prepare it along independent lines. Whether such a Grammar would be really useful is another question. When we know how complicated linguistic processes are and how soon the limits are reached when essentials alone are taken into account, we may appreciate the limited value of such a book. Purely pedagogical in scope it would be thrown into the corner with the toys of the nursery as soon as the nursery period is over. If our present Grammars are inadequate for the needs of American students it would of course be well to have a book specially prepared for them, but it would be perfectly feasible to write it on a larger plan. It could in the main differ from other Grammars only in that it is written in English. It should treat the whole subject, it would separate rules from exceptions, and through its arrangement of main paragraphs and notes it would emphasize the matter of principal interest to the beginner. Such a book would take its place by the side of other Grammars, and if in addition it were provided with a proper bibliography it would be a continual guide to the student.

Professor Luquiens has tried to solve the problem in another way. On the whole he has merely translated the text of the German Grammar, occasionally combining several paragraphs into one. To make reference simple, he has retained the original numbering of paragraphs. Where he contracts, the remodelled paragraph, though it be only a dozen lines in length, has the numbers of the contracted paragraphs (cf. § 1-4), and when he adds the addition is equally clearly indicated by his method as in § 371½. His most fundamental omission consists in the absence of the Notes of the German Grammar which usually contain the smaller and more difficult problems.

The general arrangement of the subject has not been altered. There is one feature of the German Grammar, which is entirely arbitrary and tends to create confusion in the student's mind. The Old French period is sub-divided into an early period from the beginning to about 1100 and a later one from 1100 to the beginning of the Renaissance. The whole question is one of method and is in itself perfectly logical. It has the drawback that it fails to present compactly an outline of the history of the language to the present time. In my opinion Nyrop is here preferable. No such division is made there, so that each section of the book is complete for the problem involved. Luquiens retains the division with which his model provided him, and whatever difficulties there may exist in the German arrangement, these reappear in the abridged American form.

In the next place Luquiens reduces in each paragraph the illustrative examples to one, so that for the Phonology the Grammar becomes practically a synoptic outline of phonetic changes, similar to Röttger's *Die Altfranzösischen Lautgesetze in Tabellen* with this difference, that the printed arrangement varies. Each example is preceded by a clearly worded formulation of the rule which it illustrates. For a Grammar this is a questionable proceeding. The impression of the rule is emphasized by the examples, and the strength of the Schwan-Behrens Grammar lies precisely in the large amount of illustrative material which it contains. If the student is to derive benefit from Professor Luquiens' book he will need the German original before him while he studies the abridged translation.

Furthermore the selection of examples seems to have been done thoughtlessly. Usually the choice has fallen upon the first in Behren's list, and very frequently this illustrates perfectly the principle stated in the rule. But just as frequently the rule is more comprehensive, and then the examples which follow in the German Grammar are arranged by means of proper punctuation so as to correspond to the various features of the

rule. Professor Luquiens has completely over-looked this feature, so that his rules present statements for which no examples are given. This fault occurs so constantly that it constitutes a real weakness of the book. In illustration I may cite §§ 15, 16-20, 43, 62, 86, 93, 94, 97, 100, 117, 123, 131, 161, 167, 186, etc. No attempt has been made to make this list complete. Occasionally a rule occurs without any example as §§ 60 or 153-2. In still another series of paragraphs, which however is not very extended, through an apparent desire for logical consistency the author has been led to expand Behrens' rule so that the revised version contains statements absent from the German Grammar and for which no examples could be cited. What words contain φ + epenthetic i before a nasal (§ 62) or pretonic u in similar conditions (§ 100)? In paragraph 211 we read that during the thirteenth century both $\bar{e}$ and $\check{e}$ lose their quantitative difference and become e unless they come to be final, in which case they still lose their quantitative difference but remain e . Three examples are cited: *faba* > *fēve* > *fève*, **mēttēre* > *mētre* > *mètre*, *amatu* > *amēt*, > *ame*. But where is the word showing checked $\check{e}$ having become final e ? This vowel became final only when it was followed by a consonant which ceased to be pronounced as in *missum* > *mēs*, *mittit* > *mēt*, and then its quality had been opened before the consonant disappeared.

There are further paragraphs where the condensation or elaboration of the German text has led the author to make erroneous statements. A few such instances may be cited by way of illustration. Others might be added though it would be doing the author wrong to allow the reader to infer that the book teems with such errors.

The Vulgar Latin development of vowels is treated in a single paragraph, numbered 16-20, which indicates a serious abridgment of the German text. The subject is very confusing to beginners. In the form in which it is presented here it is obscure. The student would be forced to conclude that Latin vowels possessed only the characteristic of quantity and that the differentiation into open and closed vowels is a development of the early centuries A.D.

In the history of proporoxytones, scattered through various paragraphs Professor Luquiens has overlooked the voicing of stops. *Tiep'du* §46 is wrong, just as *rap'du*, §52 (neither is found in Behrens) while §122 cites *sab'du* correctly. To be sure the problem is difficult; Neumann may not have given the final solution in *Zs. f. rom Phil.* XIV, pp. 559-563, and Behrens is exceedingly guarded in his statements §122. But this much is certain that voiced consonants must have come together where

the modern form has a voiced stop or spirant; *tiép'du* is impossible.

Friēmīta (§ 47-2) is surprising. We have had all sorts of dates for nasalization, and Luquiens is cognizant of this fact (cf. § 35-3) but the process has certainly never been dated to precede the fall of penult vowels.

Upon what authority is the seventh century (not in Behrens) cited as the date for the change of *sapi* > *sqi* (*sauui* should have been added for the sake of clearness)? Is it likely that *sqi* is older than *causa* > *chose*?

Note in § 135-3 the impossible row *ḍoçet* > *ḍuēct* > *ḍuédzt* > *ḍuē-idzt* > *ḍūidzt* > *ḍūist* (not in Behrens).

Professor Luquiens tries to show by his notation how an epenthetic *i* developed from a palatal consonant. To do this he separates the affected vowel by a hyphen from the consonant, as in *va-isel* (*vascellu*) 136, *pla-īye* (*plaga*) 140, *ma-iyour* (*majorem*) 152, *negru* > *ne-yr* > *ne-ŕ* > *nē-ir*, *tra-itier*, 158. This method gives, however, an entirely wrong conception of the process and is sure to be completely misleading to the student. The epenthetic vowel is the glide leading over to the palatal. As such it belongs to the vowel that precedes it as soon as it has acquired an independent value.

In words like *plaga*, *neçat* (§ 140) it is difficult to say how long the spirant *y* (< *c*, *g*), remains after the epenthetic *i* has been developed. According to § 151 it lives in O. Fr. *nient* (*nĕgĕnt*), the *i* doing double duty (not in Behrens). *nicnt* (*nĕgĕnt*), the *i* doing double duty (not in Behrens). This position might be defended if the palatal consonant having changed its glide into a full vowel now continues to live on as a glide consonant. But what are we to say to the history of *pagensem* (§ 152) > *pa-īyēs* > *pāiyis*, written *pais*, the *i* here doing triple duty? The pronunciation of this word was *pa-is* (correct in Behrens) until comparatively modern times; cf. Thurot *De la Prononciation Française*, I. p. 501.

Latin *l* (§ 174) does not become *u* 'after all vowels'; cf. Behrens § 281 where the history is correctly stated. This error is repeated by implication in Luquiens' § 281.

The regular n. s. of *homo* (§ 299) in O. Fr. is (*h*)*uem* or (*h*)*om*, not *uen*. Final *m* is phonetically regular and older than *n*. Luquiens looks upon *uen* and *on* as the older forms and explains *om* as due to the analogy of *ome*. It is needless to add that this paragraph is entirely reworked and that the German Grammar contains no similar statements.

The treatment of the verb, to which attention is called in the Preface is on the whole good and calculated to be serviceable. It should be stated, however, that the arrangement is

largely tabular and that Historical Grammar has been reduced to a minimum. Let us note in passing that *redēdi*=*réddidi* (§§ 338-1 and 342-2) is not a weak perfect, and that the 2 p. pl. pres. ind. and sub. of the inchoative verbs of the second weak conjugation (§§ 339 and 340) apparently ends in *-ez*; not *fenissiez*, but *fenissez*.

The book ends with an Appendix containing three short passages of French, one from each period, in phonetic transcription. Examination reveals the fact that Professor Luquiens believes in the absoluteness of phonetic law not only in isolated words, but also in stress group. In consequence these lines contain many notations which it would be difficult to defend. How could it be proved that final consonants before a word beginning with a consonant were silent in the *Roland*, that final *t* in *devant* became *d* before *lui*, that *Apollin reclaimet* was pronounced *apōlānd rēklāimēt* and *mals ne māu nē?* Phonetic theory is certainly carried to its limit here, and the explanations which follow on p. 144 only serve to emphasize this first impression.

This review should not close without pointing out certain excellent features of the little book. Its style is clear and comprehensible, the Glossary of technical terms, pp. 20-22, should be useful, and there are many small additions here and there which shed clearer light on difficult problems. While I doubt the advisability of teaching of Old French Grammar in this way, it is not impossible that students insufficiently familiar with German may find here a useful commentary provided, however, that they will keep the Schwan-Behrens Grammar constantly open before them.

JOHN E. MATZKE.

Leland Stanford Jr. University.

SCHILLER, SEIN LEBEN UND SEINE WERKE, von Karl Berger, In zwei Bänden, Zweiter Band. 812 pp., 1909.

With the appearance of the final volume of Berger's *Life of Schiller* the evil spell which has seemed hitherto to prevent the completion of a biography on a worthy scale of the best loved of the German dramatic poets is at last broken.

J. Minor's attempted "Life" remains a fragment at the end of the second volume, while its style as well as its exhaustiveness must have prevented it from becoming an interpreter of the poet to the masses, however imposing and authoritative it might have proved to the scholar and investigator. Weltrich's great work is